



MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD

**FOOD STANDARDS COMMITTEE
REPORT ON SAUSAGES**



LONDON
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
1956
NINEPENCE NET

FOOD STANDARDS COMMITTEE

The Food Standards Committee was appointed by the Minister of Food in 1947 with the following terms of reference:

To advise the Ministers of Food and Health and the Secretary of State for Scotland as to the provision to be made concerning the composition of foods (other than liquid milk) and the labelling or marking of any foods for which such provision is made, by:—

- (a) Statutory Orders under the Defence (Sale of Food) Regulations; or
- (b) Regulations (other than Milk and Dairies Regulations) under the Food and Drugs Acts, and corresponding enactments relating to Scotland;

for preventing danger to health, loss of nutritional value or otherwise protecting purchasers.

The Members of the Food Standards Committee are:

NORMAN C. WRIGHT, Esq., C.B., M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.I.C. (*Chairman*).
G. G. BARNES, Esq., C.B.E. (*Vice-Chairman*).
C. A. ADAMS, Esq., C.B.E., B.Sc., F.R.I.C., Barrister-at-Law.
N. R. BEATTIE, Esq., M.D., D.P.H.
Professor S. J. COWELL, M.B., F.R.C.P.
COLIN S. DENCE, Esq.
A. GLOVER, Esq., M.Sc., F.R.I.C.
A. J. HOWARD, Esq., M.A., F.R.I.C.
J. M. JOHNSTON, Esq., M.D., M.R.C.P.E., F.R.C.S.(Ed.), F.R.S.E.
G. W. MONIER-WILLIAMS, Esq., O.B.E., M.C., M.A., Ph.D., F.R.I.C.
J. R. NICHOLLS, Esq., C.B.E., D.Sc., F.R.I.C.
A. PROPPER, Esq., M.B.E.
R. W. SUTTON, Esq., O.B.E., B.Sc., F.R.I.C., F.C.S.
G. TAYLOR, Esq., O.B.E., F.R.I.C.
R. F. TYAS, Esq.

Joint Secretaries:

M. D. M. FRANKLIN, Esq.
W. M. SHORTT, Esq., M.Sc., F.R.I.C.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD

FOOD STANDARDS COMMITTEE

REPORT ON SAUSAGES

Introduction

1. We were invited by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food to advise whether statutory standards, or some other form of compositional control is now needed for sausages.

2. The composition of sausages was controlled under Defence Regulations throughout the war and until March, 1953. When meat products were decontrolled the then Minister of Food decided not to impose standards of composition in order to give the public an opportunity to buy, at competitive prices, a wide variety of sausages to satisfy local and personal preferences.

3. Many food and drugs authorities have continued to use the minimum levels of meat content previously in force (65 per cent for pork sausages and 50 per cent for beef sausages) as the criteria for an acceptable sausage, and successful prosecutions have been made on this basis. But in other localities this may not have been done and recent High Court cases have cast doubt on the status of these limits. Thus manufacturers, particularly if distributing over a wide area, have been in doubt as to what level of meat content would prove legally acceptable. In practice many may have felt obliged to regard the provisions of the control Order as setting *de facto* limits to the kind of sausage they could produce. This is borne out by the evidence from samples analysed by public analysts that the bulk of sausages have a meat content just above the control Order levels. The suggestion made by the Minister of Food in 1954 that traders could safeguard themselves against the risk of prosecution by declaring the meat content of their sausages on a label or ticket has not been followed up by the trade*.

4. On the other hand, local enforcing authorities have felt some reluctance to institute proceedings on the meat content of sausages in view of the doubtful legal position. The prevailing uncertainty has been emphasised on more than one occasion by the Lord Chief Justice who has pointed out that, until Ministers lay down a statutory definition of what a sausage is, the question will continue to be disputed in the Courts.

5. In framing our recommendations we have had regard to these experiences and to the situation during the control period and before the war.

6. We have consulted some 36 organisations representative of all branches of the sausage trade and local authority associations and related bodies concerned with the enforcement of food and drugs legislation in the United Kingdom. A list of the organisations which have given written or oral evidence appears in Appendix A.

The Need for Control

7. The local authority associations were unanimous in considering that some type of control over the composition of sausages was necessary in order to protect the consumer. The views of the trade bodies were conflicting. On

* Further reference is made to the declaration of meat content in paragraphs 17-19.

the whole the large factory producers were in favour of control and the organisations representing the retail butcher opposed to it. It can, however, be said that the preponderance of evidence from the trade was in favour of control, particularly if account is taken of the proportion of the total trade for which each type of producer is responsible.

8. The main argument put forward by the sections of the trade opposed to control was that consumers should be left entirely free to choose for themselves the type of sausage they wish to buy. It was argued that the sausage trade is highly competitive and a manufacturer who did not produce a sausage which was satisfactory to the consumer would soon go out of business; that the public taste for sausages varied widely from one locality to another and even from one time to another; and that any control over composition would deny to some class of consumers the type of product they preferred.

9. Objections were also raised by those who opposed control that it would not achieve the desired object. The basis of control would inevitably be the amount of meat present; but the *quality* of the meat used was at least as important as the quantity and it was held to be impossible to control the quality of meat by regulation. It was contended that a statutory requirement as to quantity might encourage the use of low quality meat, and that it would in any case offer very little protection to the consumer.

10. Regulation of the quantity of meat was itself held to be open to objection: it would, it was stated, be difficult for the small butcher making his own sausages to observe and difficult for the food and drugs authority to enforce. The sample taken might be unrepresentative, especially with the coarse sausage which was difficult to mix evenly; and methods of estimating the meat content were unreliable. There might therefore be unjustifiable prosecutions.

11. While we recognise the force in these arguments, we are impressed by the weight of the evidence that some form of control is necessary.

12. Sausages are an important food: we understand that national expenditure on sausages is of the order of £80-90 million a year. They are eaten as a main meat dish. The meat content of sausages accounts for at least 10 per cent of the total weight of carcase meat consumed. The meat in sausages is therefore an important source of animal protein. It contributes to the national diet about half as much animal protein as, for example, the total supplies of fish or eggs.

13. Even so, if the consumer could readily assess the nutritional value of sausages, there might be no need for control. But it is impossible to do this by inspection before purchase and most consumers would be quite unable to tell by taste whether a sausage contained 40 per cent, 60 per cent or 80 per cent meat. There is therefore scope for the consumer to be misled and a *prima facie* case for providing some protection.

14. The case for protection is strongly reinforced by the evidence available that prices offer no indication of meat content. In order to keep the situation under review, the Minister of Food in 1954 asked food and drugs authorities to supply information as to the price and meat content of the pork and beef sausages sampled by them. The results of over 10,000 samples are summarised in Appendix B. We see no reason to doubt the evidence of these figures that there is no significant relationship between price and meat content. Freedom from compositional control therefore offers the public no assurance that sausages with lower meat content are proportionately cheaper.

15. We therefore consider that control is desirable to protect the consumer. For the reasons given in paragraph 29, the difficulty of controlling the quality of meat by regulation does not appear to us to be a decisive argument against control. Statutory regulation of the composition of sausages will provide food and drugs authorities with a factual basis for their enforcement duties and will free manufacturers who distribute their products over a wide area from the hazards arising from the present legal position.

The Type of Control

16. Most of the organisations favouring control proposed statutory minimum standards of composition as the most appropriate means. With minimum standards, the public is assured of receiving a product the composition of which will not fall below a reasonable value, nutritionally or otherwise, while manufacturers are left free to compete in meeting the requirements of their customers by the use of different qualities of carcase meat and by varying the meat content above the minimum laid down.

17. We have considered the possibility of requiring that all sausages should bear a declaration of composition in terms of percentage of meat content. This found little support as an alternative to standards but many local authority associations held that a declaration of the percentage meat content should be required in addition to minimum standards.

18. Compulsory labelling would enable the consumer to compare the meat content of different sausages in relation to the price charged, but would present practical difficulties. We were informed by the retail trade that the butcher selling a variety of sausages of different meat contents would not only have difficulty in specifying their exact composition, but would be particularly vulnerable to prosecution because of the ease with which tickets could become displaced or accidentally interchanged.

19. For these reasons we are satisfied that compulsory labelling would not be a suitable alternative to minimum statutory standards; nor do we recommend that it should be an additional requirement.

Standards of Meat Content

20. There was a wide measure of agreement in the representations we received as to the appropriate standards of meat content. In one case a general limit of 50 per cent was suggested and higher limits were recommended by certain of the local authority associations, but the preponderant view was that there should be two standards, one of 65 per cent for pork sausages and one of 50 per cent for beef and other sausages. We have critically examined both the need for two standards and the suggested minimum percentages.

21. There is evidence that before the war pork sausages generally contained more meat than beef sausages. This was one of the reasons why, during control (except for the war years when supply considerations were paramount), there was provision for at least two standards of meat content, higher for pork than for beef. It was represented to us that the pork sausage was traditionally the "quality" sausage and ought therefore to contain a higher proportion of meat. We think it is desirable that the customary distinction should be preserved.

22. The limits of 65 per cent for pork sausages and 50 per cent for beef sausages which have been widely supported were the limits in force from 1950 until decontrol. Before that, limits had been lower because of supply

difficulties. Since decontrol, the meat content of sausages sampled by food and drugs authorities has ranged from less than 40 per cent to more than 90 per cent but the data in Appendix B suggest that the bulk of pork sausages contain 65-70 per cent meat and most beef sausages 50-60 per cent. For the reason given in paragraph 3 it cannot be assumed that this would necessarily have been the case if all manufacturers had felt free to disregard the levels of meat content in force prior to decontrol. In addition, therefore, we have examined such evidence as is available as to pre-war practice. Though there were wide variations in meat content, it appears that pork sausages usually contained 60 to 75 per cent meat and beef sausages 50 to 60 per cent. There were no standards under food and drugs legislation but a number of public analysts considered that an article containing less than 50 per cent meat could not be considered a sausage, and some convictions were obtained against traders selling sausages with a lower meat content.

23. We have considered whether special provision should be made for a sausage of low meat content in order to meet the possible criticism that a minimum meat content of 50 per cent would put sausages as a food out of the reach of some families. The evidence we received on this point both from the trade and enforcing authorities was against providing for a low meat sausage and in favour of confining the description "sausage" to the product which contained at least 50 per cent meat. Even the organisations which were opposed to standards took the view that an acceptable sausage normally contained at least 50 per cent meat. The general opinion was that there would be no demand for a low standard sausage and, bearing in mind the evidence in Appendix B which shows that a low meat content is no guarantee of cheapness, we consider that no provision should be made for a special low meat standard sausage. We recommend that the minimum standard of meat content for sausages made wholly or mainly with pork should be 65 per cent and for beef and other sausages 50 per cent.

Types of Meat to be permitted

24. The last control Order, the Meat Products (No. 3) Order, 1952 No. 2257, specified that not less than 80 per cent of the meat content of pork sausages must be pork; beef sausages included sausages the meat of which was not beef alone. The trade recommended to us that these limits (or in the case of pork sausage that not less than 50 per cent of the total weight should be pork, which is equivalent to 77 per cent. of the meat content) should be retained in any statutory standards. The local authority associations and the associations representing public analysts considered that the description "pork sausage" should apply only where the meat content is wholly pork and, with one exception, that the description "beef sausage" should apply only where the meat content is wholly beef.

25. The proposal to restrict the description "pork sausage" to the product containing only the named meat would have the merit of simplicity and would considerably reduce the enforcement difficulties arising from the identification of different types of meat. However, we are informed by the sausage manufacturers that the addition of small amounts of other meat—usually veal or beef—to pork sausages is a long standing practice in many areas and that at present many but not all reputable manufacturers continue to include some meat other than pork. The advantage claimed is that the superior binding qualities of the veal or beef improve the texture of the sausage and make it more palatable. Other considerations are also important. The use of other meat as a balancing factor makes it possible to maintain the regularity of pork sausage production despite fluctuations in the supplies of

pig meat and, in particular, the amount of fat in the available carcasses. This point applies particularly to the small manufacturer and to the retail butcher who are not always in a position to select the type of carcass required for sausage making. The addition of a small amount of veal or beef to pork sausages does not impair their nutritive value. The majority of the Committee accept these arguments and have come to the conclusion that the addition of other meat should be permitted. They recommend that the description "pork sausage" should be acceptable provided at least four-fifths of the meat content is pork. It is open to manufacturers using only pork to make suitable claims for their product by labelling or advertisement.

26. The other members of the Committee do not agree with this recommendation. In their view, to label the sausage as "pork sausage" when as much as one-fifth of its meat content is meat other than pork is likely to mislead purchasers as to the nature or substance of the food; if it were not specifically permitted, it might be held to be an offence under Section 2 or Section 6 of the Food and Drugs Act, 1955. Although trade witnesses claimed that the addition of some other meat dated back for many years and was well known, it appears that the practice was not universal and that pork sausages are on sale at present which are made from no other meat than pork. They therefore consider that the purchaser has an inalienable right to be told when this is not the case and to be supplied with the article for which he asks. Since food standards are prescribed primarily for the protection of the consumer, members of the Committee who take this view attach particular importance to the opinions of those whose statutory duty it is to enforce the Food and Drugs Act (see paragraph 24). They agree that the nutritional value of a sausage containing meat other than pork may be at least as high as that of a genuine pork sausage and that some makers may find technological advantages in admixture with other meat, but nevertheless feel that these considerations should not be allowed to undermine the case for correct and informative labelling of this food. They would not object to the sale of sausages containing up to one-fifth of meat other than pork and having the same total meat content as pork sausages provided some alternative description for them was found.

27. There is a similar difference of view over the use of the description "beef sausage". Traditionally, beef sausages have contained other meats than beef and butchers are accustomed to use for this purpose cuts or trimmings of mutton, pork fat, etc. The majority of the Committee therefore consider it reasonable to use the description "beef sausage" provided not less than four-fifths of the meat content is beef or veal. The other members would restrict the description to the product made wholly with beef or veal and apply some alternative description to the product containing a limited amount of other meat.

28. For the purposes of controlling the composition of sausages, we would define meat as bacon, ham, beef, mutton, lamb, veal, pork, edible offals, poultry, game, rabbit, hare and venison. Offals which are prohibited in uncooked open meat products by the Offals in Meat Products Order, 1953 No. 246* should be excluded from sausages and we recommend that this Order should be retained.

Control of Meat Quality

29. The quality of meat depends on a number of factors—the proportion of fat and gristle, the texture of the fibres, the flavour, the tenderness and

* The prohibited offals are brains, feet, frys, gut (including chitterlings) manifolds, paunches, udders, sweetbreads, tripe, melts or lites, spinal cord, uteri, pigs' maws and calves' veals.

the freshness of the meat. Some of these are not susceptible of statutory control, but to the extent that they adversely affect the quality of a meat product like sausages, the consumer is in a much better position to judge them than, for example, to judge the quantity of meat. For instance, the public can readily detect the presence of gristle in sausages and are quick to complain if it is present. Manufacturers are therefore at pains to remove as much as possible, though we are informed that in practice it is impossible to guarantee that the meat in sausages will be entirely free from gristle. Any attempt to control the amount of gristle or to regulate some of the other quality factors which have been mentioned would present both analysts and manufacturers with considerable difficulties, and because of the measure of control which the public are able to exercise themselves, we do not consider it necessary to recommend statutory requirements. We take a different view, however, about the proportion of fat to lean meat.

30. Because of the importance of the protein content of the meat in sausages a minimum standard of meat content could be said to be incomplete without a limit to the proportion of fat in the meat. Evidence from certain public analysts, summarised in Appendix C, reveals a very wide range in the proportion of fat at present in sausages. There also appears to have been a tendency for the proportion of fat in sausages to increase during recent years. We are informed by the sausage manufacturers that the proportion of fat to lean meat varies with the type and quality of meat used; that about 45 per cent of the meat in a good quality pork sausage might be fat; and that the sausage containing a high proportion of fat is often the most palatable. On the other hand, the public needs to be protected against the inclusion of excessive amounts of fat. With the use of phosphates, which enables a higher proportion of fat to be added without danger that the sausage will collapse on cooking, an unduly high proportion of fat trimmings might be included to the detriment of the consumer; this greatly strengthens the case for controlling the fat content.

31. The majority of enforcing authorities considered that some control of fat content was necessary. The trade were opposed to it and have pointed out the difficulties in complying with such a requirement. It was represented to us that if, nevertheless, limits were laid down there should be a tolerance because of the practical difficulties. In addition to the fat which can be trimmed off there is a significant amount of fat within the lean meat. The amount of this type of fat varies with the cut, from one per cent up to a maximum of 18 per cent; thus it is claimed that even if the practical difficulties of ensuring the proper separation of the "trimmable" fat from the lean are overcome, it is not possible for either the large manufacturer or for the butcher to know exactly how much fat there will prove to be in his sausages on chemical analysis. A statutory limit, which has to be based on fat as revealed by analysis rather than on the proportion of trimmable fat used by the sausage maker, must therefore take account of this variable source of fat. We are informed that good commercial practice in making sausages is to use two parts of trimmed lean meat to one part of fat; if this is so a limit of 50 per cent would allow a reasonable margin. We therefore recommend that the amount of fat in all sausages should be limited to 50 per cent of the meat content. The inclusion of such a limit in a statutory order will safeguard the public, and the fact that nearly 90 per cent of the pork sausage samples and over 90 per cent of the beef sausage samples already conform to the limit suggests that it should be readily achieved by the trade.

Other ingredients

32. Opinion among the organisations submitting evidence was divided on the need for control of ingredients other than meat but the majority view

was that, provided substances were not detrimental to health, there was no need to limit the number that could be used. We would not wish to give a *carte blanche* to the addition of any substance to sausages but we do not consider that statutory control need be imposed on the substances known to be used in sausages at present. Our views are amplified in the following paragraphs.

33. Bread is the traditional filling for sausage, but rusk is also widely used. Rice is apparently being used in some localities. We see no objection to the use of any of these or other starchy fillers.

34. It was represented to us by a manufacturer of soya products that soya should be a permitted ingredient to replace part of the meat content of sausages. During the early part of the period of control the use of soya in sausages was prohibited but with the acute shortage of meat the use of a certain proportion of soya in sausages was made compulsory; subsequently, its use was permissive. While soya is unquestionably of considerable nutritional value, we do not think the public would expect to find it used in place of meat. There can be no objection to soya being used in the filler.

35. Hog and sheep casings are used for sausage making, the choice largely depending on the number of links per lb. the manufacturer wishes to make. Artificial casings are also used. We see no reason why the manufacturer should not be free to use whichever type of casing is required.

36. We understand that artificial colour is often used in sausages to obtain a uniform appearance; this subject is covered by the supplementary report of the Preservatives Sub-Committee on colouring matters in food, which we have accepted.

37. The addition of mono sodium glutamate to sausages to enhance the flavour of the meat is now a fairly well established practice and in recent years phosphates have come into use to improve the emulsification and to retain the fat in the sausage on cooking. Both are fairly common ingredients in other foods. Their ability to improve the sausage might result in the consumer being misled as to the amount of meat and fat present, but provided there are minimum standards of meat content and limits to the proportions of fat, as we recommend, we do not consider it necessary to ban their use.

Scope of the Standards

38. The word "sausage", originally applied only to the meat product, is now also used to connote shape. For this reason we cannot object to its use as part of the description of a product which resembles the familiar meat product in shape but is made from other materials, *provided* it is accompanied by the appropriate adjective, e.g., "vegetarian sausage", "fish sausage" or "soya sausage". But part from these non-meat products, we consider that all sausages should conform to the appropriate standards; i.e. 65 per cent meat content for pork sausages and 50 per cent for beef sausages. Other meat sausages should also contain at least 50 per cent meat and normally be described so as to indicate the type of meat used, e.g., "pork and beef sausage", "mixed meat sausage", etc.

39. We consider that the standards should apply to products which are similar to sausages in composition but not necessarily in shape, viz., sausage meat, skinless sausages, chipolatas and slicing sausages whether or not they are filled into casings or loose wrappers.

40. Products which are sold under a trade name or other description that does not include the word "sausage", "sausage meat", etc., as the case may be, but which are similar in appearance and composition to such products, should conform to the appropriate standard.

41. The standards which we have recommended are intended to relate to uncooked products. Changes in composition take place during cooking that would make it inappropriate to apply the same standards to sausages in the cooked state. Speciality types of sausage which are ready to eat, e.g., Frankfurter, liver sausage, salami, polony, black pudding, breakfast and luncheon sausages are therefore excluded from the scope of the present recommendations. Canned sausages are heat processed although they may require further cooking before they are eaten. For the time being it is proposed that they also be excluded.

Catering Establishments

42. The general view of the catering industry is that foods prepared by caterers should not be subject to statutory control. It was represented to us that this should apply to sausages, and that in any case there should be an exemption for sausages made on the catering premises at which they were to be sold at a meal. But we consider that whether sausages are bought cooked at a catering establishment or uncooked by retail the public has an equal right to protection. In any event, the bulk of sausages sold in catering establishments are either purchased from a sausage manufacturer or manufactured centrally by large caterers for distribution to branches and there would appear to be little practical difficulty in complying with the standard. We therefore consider that catering sales should come within the scope of any statutory standards; the standards should be enforced in respect of uncooked sausages etc. in the possession of catering establishments and intended for sale cooked as part of a meal.

Enforcement

43. Most of the criticism of enforcement can be met by correct sampling to ensure that the public analyst receives an adequate, representative sample. We would regard $1\frac{1}{2}$ lb. sausages, of which the analyst would receive $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. as the minimum size for a sample. The methods of analysis of total meat and of fat content are considered adequate by the Association of Public Analysts and have been found reliable in practice for purposes of enforcement. We are, however, informed that while it is possible to detect the presence of a second meat in a sausage, no method of analysis is yet available whereby the amount of the second meat can be determined.

Summary of Recommendations

44. We recommend that regulations should be made providing for the following:—

- (a) A minimum standard of meat content of 65 per cent for sausages made wholly or mainly with pork and of 50 per cent for all other meat sausages (paragraph 23).
- (b) The meat content to be restricted to bacon, ham, beef, mutton, lamb, veal, pork, edible offals (other than prohibited offals), poultry, game, rabbit, hare and venison (paragraph 28).
- (c) The proportion of fat not to exceed 50 per cent of the total meat content (paragraph 31).

- (a) The standards to apply to uncooked sausages, sausage meat, skinless sausages, chipolatas and slicing sausages (paragraphs 39 and 41).
- (e) The sale of sub-standard sausages to be prohibited (paragraph 40).
- (f) The standard to apply to sausages etc. intended for sale by catering establishments (paragraph 42).
- (g) As regards the use of the descriptions "pork sausage" and "beef sausage", the majority of the Committee consider that these descriptions should apply where at least four-fifths of the meat content consists of the named meat, but certain members of the Committee consider that they should only apply where the meat content consists wholly of the named meat and that suitable alternative descriptions should be found for sausages containing up to one-fifth of other meat (paragraphs 25-27).

FSC/REP. 37

30th May, 1956.

APPENDIX A

Written statements or representations have been received from the following organisations:—

- *Sausage Manufacturers Association
- *Parliamentary Committee of the Co-operative Union
- National Association of Multiple Grocers
- *Association of Multiple Retail Meat Traders
- *National Federation of Meat Traders' Associations
 - National Federation of Licensed Retail Kosher Butchers and Poulterers
 - *National Federation of Grocers and Provision Dealers' Associations
 - National Association of Wholesale Suppliers to the Meat and Allied Trades
 - National Committee of the Wholesale Provision Trade
- *Small Consultative Committee of the Catering Industry
 - Provision Importers' Association
- *Scottish Association of Sausage and Cooked Meat Manufacturers
- *Scottish Pork Butchers' Association
- *Scottish Federation of Meat Traders' Association
 - City of Derry Master Butchers and Meat Trades' Association
 - Belfast Co-operative Society Ltd.
- *British Soya Products Ltd.
- W. L. Miller and Sons Ltd.
- The Rusk Manufacturers' Federation
- Borough of Southwark
- Metropolitan Boroughs Standing Joint Committee
- Association of Municipal Corporations
- Urban District Councils Association
- Rural District Councils Association
- County Councils Association
- Association of Sea and Air Port Health Authorities
- Scottish Counties of Cities Association
- Association of County Councils in Scotland
- Convention of Royal Burghs
- *Association of Public Analysts
 - Association of Public Analysts of Scotland
 - Association of Health Committees (Northern Ireland)
- Irish Embassy
- New Zealand Trade Commissioner
- Australian Trade Commissioner
- South African Trade Commissioner

* These organisations also gave oral evidence.

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF SAUSAGES SAMPLED BY FOOD AND DRUGS AUTHORITIES SINCE DECONTROL
(March 1953–December 1955)

Table 1: Trend of Price and Meat Content

Quarter ended	Pork Sausages		Beef Sausages	
	Average Meat Content per cent.	Average Price (pence per lb.)	Average Meat Content per cent.	Average Price (pence per lb.)
1953— 12	67	2 8	58	1 11½
June*	67	2 8½	62	1 11½
September	66	2 8	59	1 11
1954—	65	2 8	58	2 0
March	67	2 7½	60	1 11
June	68	2 6½	63	2 0½
September	68	2 6½	61	1 11½
1955—	67	2 6½	61	2 0½
March	69	2 5½	62	1 11½
June	68	2 5	63	2 1
September	67	2 11	60	2 0
December				

* Four months March–June, 1953.

Table 2: Distribution of Samples by Price and Meat Content

(a) Pork Sausages

Price per lb.	Meat Content										Total Number of Samples
	44 per cent. or less	45 per cent. 49 per cent.	50 per cent. 54 per cent.	55 per cent. 59 per cent.	60 per cent. 64 per cent.	65 per cent. 69 per cent.	70 per cent. 74 per cent.	75 per cent. 79 per cent.	80 per cent. and over		
1s. 11d. and under	2	3	6	13	17	41	18	10	4	114	
2s. 0d.	—	5	10	16	38	53	26	17	6	171	
2s. 2d.	1	1	6	19	25	61	22	12	6	153	
2s. 3d.	—	2	4	5	25	57	21	9	6	129	
2s. 4d.	3	7	30	38	81	169	76	42	22	468	
2s. 5d.	—	3	10	12	28	18	7	4	82	82	
2s. 6d.	9	28	71	105	367	732	347	170	109	1,938	
2s. 7d.	—	2	5	23	55	128	55	20	8	296	
2s. 8d.	—	10	30	88	169	464	220	107	55	1,151	
2s. 9d.	—	4	22	45	120	259	101	30	14	596	
2s. 10d.	3	1	7	27	69	168	86	26	24	411	
2s. 11d.	—	—	5	12	15	10	1	2	45	45	
3s. 0d.	3	11	21	88	199	128	53	55	55	559	
Over 3s. 0d.	1	1	8	42	151	77	33	22	335	335	
	31	64	206	423	1,120	2,525	1,205	537	337	6,448	
Average selling price per lb.	2s. 7d.	2s. 5½d.	2s. 6½d.	2s. 6d.	2s. 7½d.	2s. 7d.	2s. 7½d.	2s. 7d.	2s. 7½d.	2s. 7d.	

* In view of the small number of samples taken at 2s. 1d. per lb., these figures have been included with those selling at 2s. 2d.

(b) Beef Sausages

Price per lb.	Meat Content										Total Number of Samples
	44 per cent. or less	45 per cent. to 49 per cent.	50 per cent. to 54 per cent.	55 per cent. to 59 per cent.	60 per cent. to 64 per cent.	65 per cent. to 69 per cent.	70 per cent. to 74 per cent.	75 per cent. to 79 per cent.	80 per cent. and over		
1s. 3d. and under	1	3	9	6	6	8	3	—	2	38	
1s. 4d.	3	2	5	10	3	7	1	3	4	38	
1s. 6d. *	8	12	63	47	42	30	18	12	8	240	
1s. 7d.	—	—	4	3	4	2	3	—	1	17	
1s. 8d.	12	22	80	70	79	40	25	19	16	363	
1s. 9d.	4	4	39	39	22	22	10	7	6	149	
1s. 10d.	12	22	138	113	119	73	45	28	35	585	
1s. 10½d.	1	6	44	28	18	8	10	4	3	122	
1s. 11d.	5	50	41	25	20	12	8	2	2	163	
2s. 0d.	35	97	416	427	327	245	138	91	60	1,836	
2s. 1d.	—	—	9	18	11	10	3	3	3	57	
2s. 2d.	6	14	65	61	51	42	20	17	6	282	
2s. 3d.	2	4	17	37	21	18	8	12	10	129	
2s. 4d.	2	6	34	58	55	36	27	15	15	220	
2s. 6d. *	5	34	54	67	57	45	23	19	19	304	
Over 2s. 6d.	—	4	12	9	21	26	23	12	12	119	
	82	206	1,019	1,021	871	644	391	234	202	4,660	
Average selling price per lb.	1s. 10½d.	1s. 11d.	1s. 11½d.	1s. 11½d.	2s. 0d.	2s. 0½d.	2s. 0½d.	2s. 0½d.	2s. 0½d.	1s. 11½d.	

* In view of the small number of samples taken at 1s. 5d. and 2s. 5d. per lb., these figures have been included with those selling at 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. respectively.

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF FAT CONTENT AS A PROPORTION OF THE MEAT CONTENT
OF SAUSAGES ANALYSED BY CERTAIN PUBLIC ANALYSTS DURING 1955

	Fat as Percentage of Total Meat								
	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65
	9	21	81	147	192	162	57	18	8
<i>Pork Sausages (695 samples)</i>	1.3	3.0	11.6	21.2	27.6	23.3	8.2	2.6	1.2
<i>Beef Sausages (458 samples)</i>	9	40	87	122	117	49	21	7	6
	2.0	8.7	19.0	26.7	25.6	10.7	4.6	1.5	1.3

Crown copyright reserved

Printed and published by
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

To be purchased from
York House, Kingsway, London w.c.2
423 Oxford Street, London w.1
P.O. Box 569, London s.e.1
13a Castle Street, Edinburgh 2
109 St. Mary Street, Cardiff
39 King Street, Manchester 2
Tower Lane, Bristol 1
2 Edmund Street, Birmingham 3
80 Chichester Street, Belfast
or through any bookseller

Printed in Great Britain

S.O. Code No. 24-247